REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1-14 remain in the application. Claims 1-3 have been amended to define the invention more clearly and to address a formal objection raised in the office action. These are clearly not narrowing amendments. In particular, the elimination of the term "rotor" from the claims cannot be considered a narrowing amendment. The term "stator" has been amended to define a "stator cap" to ensure that the terms used in the claims have proper support in the specification. This minor change in terminology is not a narrowing amendment. The definition of the shaft as a fixed shaft also is not a narrowing amendment, and is fully consistent with the original claim phrase that defined "a shaft (7) intended for being fixedly mounted on supporting elements."

The Examiner object to the original drawings because they did not show "a stator" or "a rotor".

Stators and rotors are well known in the art pertaining to drum drives and are shown, for example, in the Danish reference that is mentioned on page 2 of the subject application and incorporated into the specification by reference. Counsel had considered amending this application to include a figure from the Danish reference to provide support for the originally recited "rotor" and "stator". However, to avoid creating a new matter issue, claim 1 has been amended to eliminate all reference to the "rotor". Additionally, the term "stator" has been amended to positively recite a "stator cap", thereby conforming to the original specification and figures.

Claims 1 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,361,914 to Janssen. The Examiner concluded that Janssen

discloses a drum drive comprising a cylindrical drum that delimits an internal space for receiving an electromotor with a stator and a rotor for producing rotational movement of a drum about a shaft intended for being fixedly mounted on supporting elements 6. The Examiner concluded that the stator is turnably journalled about the shaft and that the motor comprises at least one resilient damping device connected to the shaft and to the stator. The Examiner concluded that the damping device is intended for absorbing forces that strive to cause the stator to rotate about the shaft.

The rejection is traversed with respect. The Janssen reference is limited to a bearing support in the form of a bracket. Janssen has no suggestion of "a drum drive comprising an essentially cylindrical drum that delimits an internal space intended for receiving an electromotor" as stated in the office action. Admittedly, the plastic bearing support in the form of a bracket disclosed in Janssen is intended for use with motors. The motor will have a stator, and screws can be passed through the apertures 4, 5 of the bracket 1 to support the bracket 1 of Janssen to the stator. The stator referenced in Janssen, by definition, is non-rotatable, and hence the bracket 1 of Janssen also is non-rotatable. The Janssen bracket further includes a "slide-type bearing 6 for supporting the shaft of the motor." The shaft of the motor referenced in Janssen clearly is the rotational component of the Janssen motor. Accordingly, the bearing 6 of the Janssen bracket 1 cannot be fixed to the shaft of the motor. Any such fixed connection would cause the stator to rotate, thereby having the implausible arrangement where the stator is a rotor. Accordingly, Janssen is not directed to a drum drive as recited in the original claims. Rather, Janssen is directed to a much different environment where a non-rotatable bearing

is secured to a stator and is constructed so that a rotatable shaft passing through the bearing may transmit vibrations to the bearing 6 but not to the stator.

In contrast, the claimed invention is directed to a drum drive with "an essentially cylindrical drum that delimits and internal space intended for receiving an electromotor for producing a rotating movement of the drum about a fixed shaft." As noted above, Janssen has nothing to do with a drum drive and has no suggestion of a drum for receiving an electromotor for producing a rotating movement of the drum about a fixed shaft. To the contrary, Janssen relates to a bearing for surrounding a rotating shaft and merely prevents vibrations of the rotating shaft from being transmitted to the stator. Accordingly, it is submitted that Janssen does not teach or suggest the invention defined by amended independent claim 1 and its dependent claims 9-11.

Claims 2-8 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Janssen considered in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,969,446 to Eisenhaure et al. The Examiner acknowledged that Janssen has no suggestion of the configuration of the damping device set forth in these dependent claims. Accordingly, the Examiner turned to Eisenhaure et al. for its teaching of a damping device that the Examiner considered to be relevant to the damping device set forth in the dependent claims.

It is submitted that the damping device taught or suggested by Eisenhaure et al. is structurally and functionally much different than the damping device set forth in the amended claims of the subject invention. More significantly, however, Eisenhaure et al. does not overcome the deficiencies of Janssen as explained above. Hence, it is submitted that the invention defined by claims 2-8 and 12-14 is not obvious over the hypothetical combination of Janssen and Eisenhaure et al.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the amended claims are directed to patentable subject matter and allowance is solicited. The Examiner is urged to contact applicant's attorney at the number below to expedite the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.
Atty. Reg. No. 30,066
Customer No. 001218
CASELLA & HESPOS LLP
274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703
New York, NY 10016
Tel. (212) 725-2450
Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: June 19, 2006